

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claim 1 is amended to further define the presently claimed invention. The claim amendments are supported by the specification and the originally filed claims. No new matter has been added.

Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schroeder et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,829,957) in view of Nishizawa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,268,704) and further in view of Miyashita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,759,643) and the Abstract of JP 2000265133 ("JP '133"). Claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7-11 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Schroeder et al. in view of Nishizawa et al. and further in view of Miyashita et al. and Hosotani (U.S. Patent No. 6,114,803). These rejections are traversed.

The presently claimed invention is directed to "[a]n adhesive film for a display, comprising: a transparent substrate, an anti-reflection layer provided on one surface of said transparent substrate, and an adhesive layer provided on the other surface of said transparent substrate, said anti-reflection layer being formed by resin in which low refractive index material disperses therein, said anti-reflection layer and said adhesive layer each having a predetermined color for rendering said adhesive film achromatic when said predetermined color of said anti-reflection layer is mixed with said predetermined color of said adhesive layer, and said predetermined color of said adhesive layer being colored by a colorant comprising carbon black, wherein the predetermined color of said anti-reflection layer is different from the predetermined color of said adhesive layer" (claim 1).

Applicant emphasizes that the anti-reflection layer and the adhesive layer of the presently claimed invention are each colored with a “different” predetermined color, and that the adhesive film is rendered achromatic when the predetermined color of the anti-reflection layer is mixed with the predetermined color of the adhesive layer. Applicant also emphasizes the advantages of the presently claimed invention, which include “superior image contrast and color reproduction” (Specification, page 32, lines 12-13).

Applicant respectfully submits that Schroeder et al., Nishizawa et al., Miyashita et al., JP '133 and/or Hosotani, do not teach or suggest “said anti-reflection layer and said adhesive layer each having a separate predetermined color for rendering said adhesive film achromatic when said predetermined color of said anti-reflection layer is mixed with said predetermined color of said adhesive layer,” as required by claim 1.

In contrast, Schroeder et al. discloses a “method of producing an anti-reflective film” which “involves the step of imparting a texture to the surface of an optically transparent film” (Schroeder et al., column 7, lines 10-13). The texture may be imparted by “providing an optically transparent adhesive on the film construction” (Schroeder et al., column 7, lines 28-34). Through the method of Schroeder et al., an anti-reflection layer formed by forming a roughened surface on the surface thereof is provided on one surface of a substrate, and an adhesive layer is provided on the other surface of the transparent substrate.

As such, Applicant submits that the method of formation distinguishes the anti-reflection layer in Schroeder et al. from the anti-reflection layer of the presently claimed invention in which inorganic low refractive index material, etc., is dispersed in resin. Thus, Schroeder et al. does not teach or suggest the anti-reflection layer of the

presently claimed invention. Schroeder et al. also does not teach or suggest that the anti-reflection layer and the adhesive layer each have a different predetermined color to render the adhesive film achromatic as required by claim 1.

Meanwhile, Nishizawa et al. discloses a “double coating film composed of a conductive high-refractive first layer and a low-refractive second layer” (Nishizawa et al., column 2, lines 2-4). The “high refractive first layer is formed by mixing particles of one or more noble metal elements” (Nishizawa et al., column 3, lines 14-16). Meanwhile, the low refractive index layer is disclosed as being made of silicon oxide. Further, “the body color of the cathode ray tube may be changed to an achromatic color by adding coloring matter which is complementary to the coloring of the body color of the cathode ray tube to the low-refractive second layer” (Nishizawa et al., column 2, lines 49-52).

As such, Applicant submits that the anti-reflection layer of Nishizawa et al. does not teach or suggest the anti-reflection layer of the presently claimed invention in which inorganic low refractive index material, etc., is dispersed in resin. Further, Nishizawa et al. also does not teach or suggest that the anti-reflection layer and the anti-adhesive layer each have a different predetermined color to render the adhesive film achromatic as required by claim 1. Nishizawa et al. merely discloses that the anti-reflection layer is an achromatic color, not that a second layer, such as the adhesive layer is also colored to render the entire adhesive film achromatic.

Accordingly, neither Schroeder et al. nor Nishizawa et al. teach or suggest the structure of the anti-reflection layer of the presently claimed invention or that the adhesive film is rendered achromatic by the predetermined colors of the anti-reflection layer and the adhesive layer.

In addition, Applicant respectfully submits that those of skill in the art would not have combined the teachings of Schroeder et al. and Nishizawa et al. Schroeder et al. emphasizes the disadvantages of the prior art anti-reflection coatings formed when “small particles are deposited onto the surface ... by dip coating” (Schroeder et al., column 1, lines 32-43). Meanwhile, Nishizawa et al. discloses that “double coating film is formed by applying a solution, in which metal particles for forming the conductive high-refractive first layer are dispersed, on the outer face of the faceplate of the panel section ...” (Nishizawa et al., column 6, lines 20-43). Thus, the disclosure of Schroeder et al. teaches away from the anti-reflection coatings of Nishizawa et al., such that those of skill would not have combined the disclosure of these two references.

Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Miyashita et al. does not satisfy the deficiencies of Schroeder et al. and Nishizawa et al., as Miyashita et al. does not teach or suggest that “said anti-reflection layer and said adhesive layer each having a pre-determined color for rendering said adhesive film achromatic when said predetermined color of said anti-reflection layer is mixed with said pre-determined color of said adhesive layer,” as required by claim 1. Thus, Applicant submits that the unexpected advantages of the presently claimed invention, such as superior image and color reproduction (see, e.g., specification, page 3, lines 9-10 and page 32, lines 10-14), would not be enabled by the combination of these three cited references.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither JP ‘133 nor Hosotani overcome the deficiencies of Schroeder et al., Nishizawa et al. and Miyashita et al. The specification states the following:

... the overall color of a film can be made to be achromatic, for example, black or neutral gray, by providing a colored layer having a relationship of being complementary color to the color of another colored layer containing the material (the color mixed with each color of the colored layers when two or more, for example, an anti-reflective layer and an infrared ray blocking layer, are laminated, respectively), and superior image contrast and color reproduction can be exhibited in the case in which an adhesive layer is used in a display.

(Specification, page 3, first paragraph).

In contrast, JP '133 merely discloses carbon black dispersed in the adhesive layer in order to adjust light transmittance and light scattering ratio of an image displaying part, and not to color the adhesive layer. Therefore, component and effects of the adhesive film for a display according to the present invention are different from those of the adhesive film in JP '133. Meanwhile, Hosotani et al. merely discloses the use of dispersed carbon black and blue and violet pigments. Neither JP '133 nor Hosotani teach or suggest two separate layers of predetermined "complementary" color so that the "overall color of a film can be made to be achromatic" and thereby allow for the "superior image contrast and color reproduction" of the presently claimed invention.

In fact, Applicant respectfully submits that Hosotani teaches away from the selection of two predetermined "complementary" colors that allow the adhesive film to be rendered achromatic when the colors are mixed. Hosotani discloses the following:

Here, the carbon black **35**, the blue pigment **35** and the violet pigment **37** may be dispersed either in the silica film **34**, or both in the transparent conductive film **33** and the silicon film **34**. Alternatively, the carbon black **35**, the blue pigment **35** and the violet pigment **37** may be individually dispersed either in the transparent conductive film **33** and the silica film **34**, or between them, since their arrangement is arbitrary.

(Hosotani, column 6, lines 33-41) (emphasis added).

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited combinations of references do not teach or suggest an “anti-reflection layer and said adhesive layer each having a predetermined color for rendering said adhesive film achromatic when said predetermined color of said anti-reflection layer is mixed with said predetermined color of said adhesive layer” as required by claim 1. As all of the elements of claim 1 are not taught or suggested by either of the cited combinations of references, Applicant respectfully submits that those of skill in the art would not have found claim 1 obvious over either of the cited combinations of references. Further, dependent claims 2-11 should be patentable for at least the same reasons. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-2, 4-5 and 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Schroeder et al. in view of Nishizawa et al., and further in view of Miyashita et al. and JP ‘133, and/or Schroeder et al. in view of Nishizawa et al. and further in view of Miyashita et al. and Hosotani.


Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to

counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing attorney docket number **108421-00016**.

Please charge any fee deficiency or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 01-2300, referencing attorney docket number **108421-00016**.

Respectfully submitted,


Amy E. L. Schoenhard
Registration No. 46,512

Customer No. 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 400
Washington, D.C. 20036-5339
Tel: (202) 857-6000
Fax: (202) 638-4810

TECH/292698.2